REMARKS

All of the claims have been rejected as being anticipated by Takai. As set forth clearly in MPEP 2131, to anticipate a claim, the cited reference must teach every element of the claim. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has mischaracterized what Takai discloses and, as a result, the Examiner has failed to set forth a proper case of anticipation.

The Examiner contends that Takai's edge detector 11 discloses "an edge detector configured to detect rising and trailing edges of the clock signal." The Examiner considers the clock signal to be the CLK signal shown in Takai's Figure 1. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has mischaracterized Takai's edge detector 11.

At col. 14, lines 55-58, it is indicated that the circuit 11 is a receiving circuit "which has a circuit for detecting edges of the inputting external clock signals 1." Here, it is not specifically disclosed whether the "edges" detected are rising edges, trailing edges, or both. However, as shown in Takai's Figure 1, the output of the circuit 11 is denoted by reference numeral 2. Figure 3 is a timing diagram that shows the relationship between the CLK signal 1 and the output 2 of the circuit 11. It can be clearly seen from Figure 2 that the signal 2 includes a sequence of pulses, and the pulses appear to be based on the rising edges of the CLK signal 1.

Significantly, the signal 2 has no pulses or other indication that appear to be based on the trailing edges of the CLK signal 1. Clearly, in any event, there are not pulses based on rising edges in the CLK signal 1 and pulses based on trailing edges in the CLK signal 1. Thus, the Examiner's assertions with regard to the circuit 11 detecting rising edges and trailing edges is unsupported.

Given the Examiner's mischaracterization of Takai's alleged disclosure with respect to detecting trailing edges of a clock signal, it follows that Takai also fails to disclose a "second delay signal generator," since the second delay signal generator operates based on the trailing edge of the clock signal." It further follows that Takai fails to recite the "logic unit" configured as recited in claim 1.

Given the similarities of claim 6 to claim 1, our traversal of the Examiner's rejections with respect to claim 1 are incorporated herein with respect to claim 6.

We now discuss the Examiner's contentions with regard to the dependent claims. While the Examiner does ostensibly address the features recited in claims 2 and 7 ("a cycle duration of the pulse signal is set equal to a cycle duration of the clock signal"), the Examiner does not address the features recited in claims 3 and 8 ("the first and second delay values are each set less than half a cycle duration of the clock signal"). The Examiner also does not address the features recited in claims 4 and 9 ("the first and second delay values are equal to each other"). For at least these reasons, also, the Examiner has failed to set forth a proper case of anticipation of claims 3, 4, 8 and 9.

With particular regard to claim 5, the Examiner cites Takai's elements 12a and 12b as disclosing "a first D flip-flop" and "a second flip-flop" of which the edge detector is alleged to be comprised. As shown in Figure 2, the elements 12a and 12b are part of the element labeled 12. The element labeled 12 is shown in Figure 1 as "Timing Gen." and not the edge detector 11, which the Examiner contends discloses "the edge detector configured to detect rising and trailing edges of the clock signal."

Put simply, the Examiner's contentions with respect to Takai's alleged disclosure of the elements recited in claim 5 are wholly inconsistent with the Examiner's contentions with respect to Takai's alleged disclosure of the elements recited in claim 1. This is even though claim 5 is a recitation of what an element recited in claim 1 is comprised of.

CONCLUSION

As discussed in detail above, it is respectfully contended that the Examiner has failed to set forth a proper prima facie case of anticipation. This is primarily due to the Examiner's mischaracterization of the Takai reference, but is also due to the Examiner's failure to even address some of the claims.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections and to provide a Notice of Allowance for this application. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Alan S. Hodes
Reg. No. 38,185

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300